

2/16/70

Dear Gary,

As you know, I have been anxious to clean up COUP and return to the autopsy writing. One of the troubling things has been your opinion about the discussion of homosexuality on p. 113. You were not able to ~~rewrite~~ this to fit that precise space, and I do not regard myself as competent to rewrite what you sent to fit that space. Therefore, I propose using this note, with reference to that page, at the end, where I will have several pages of notes updating those things worthy of it.

I hope this satisfied you, by which I mean I hope you will regard it as adequate, as presenting another side, and as warning the reader it may be erroneous and in any event is not intended for universal application. If you let me know promptly, I can make any changes and additions necessary on this note. However, I have done all the notes I now plan and as soon as Lil gets the time I'll be having her type them, final typing. I plan this to appear at the end of the appendix, not before it, so that, in a real crunch, something else can be added, without repegging the appendix and redoing a large part of the index, which is closer to completion (Lil is on p. 482).

On my own situation, I made an observation last night and seek your interpretation of its meaning, if you think the one experience warrants. I've been somewhat more anxious the past few days, and I don't really know why. To a degree, the long consultation/examination, even without some of the things you suggested, was reassuring. As the day wore on yesterday, I got more and more nervous. The only thing I can relate to it may be entirely unrelated, the fascism from Chicago, the announcing of the contempt sentences. But, several hours after supper Lil and I got on what we'd had to put aside because of the press of her own work, the comment of the IRS auditor on his examination of our records. I hadn't seen it. He postulates much more income than we had and he finds records of cash expenditures in excess of those we actually made. We had expected a refund on returns of earlier years adequate to take care of the cost of our indebtedness for the entire year.

Once I saw his figures, I would have expected myself to get really disturbed. I didn't. Quite the opposite. I settled down considerably and was able to figure much of it out. While we fell short of accounting for all the discrepancies he has under "cash", we have accounted for most of them as his misreading of our books and the necessary transfers from one of our accounts to another. We can account for all he has under projected income above what we declared that way (for the major year, 1967, the one we worked on). It is simply such transfers of funds. (That is the year I got all the money from Dell that I did get). It may be that going over all our enormous records to account for all of this, as should be possible, will be beyond our capacities. I am hopeful that with what we can show him he'll be satisfied. Some of the cash, for example, where I spent cash, came from checks I cashed immediately, to have immediate funds, instead of depositing the checks. But the checks are listed in our books, not hidden at all. Thus he has the same sums twice. But my point is that there was a kind of crisis, for us the most serious and a pressing problem, and it did not make me anxious but instead, steadied and settled me. I had no trouble at all falling asleep afterward. It suggests to me that where I have tangible problems, those with which I can cope immediately or those to which I know answers should be possible, no sweat, no anxiety. What do you say, doctor?

From your silence on it, I presume you did not know what has been reported to me, that Lifton is selling copies of the Zapruder-Shaneyfelt testimony (NO) for \$15, which should yield him a profit. As the enclosure shows, I am interested in how he got them. John is, of course, a possibility, although his letters to me indicate the opposite. Do you suppose you might write Fred about this, mildly indignant that the offer was not made to you, and asking how Dave is able to pull this coup?

If this is true, is it not strange that Paul has been silent on it? He did, after all, make what I got available to Dave knowing I desired otherwise.

Shaneyfelt we should have. But we might also ask what else they have and the price at which each is sold. Maybe they are also selling Finck and Frazier?

No word from N.O. re my inquiries. Separate note for something I want to send Paul.

Best,